

Jun 28 05 03:37p

SVIPG

408 971 4660

P. 1

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 28 2005

# ZILKA-KOTAB

PC  
ZILKA, KOTAB & FEECE™

95 SOUTH MARKET ST. STE 420  
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

TELEPHONE (408) 971-2573  
FAX (408) 971-4660

## FAX COVER SHEET

Date: June 28, 2005	Phone Number	Fax Number
To: Patent Appeal Briefs, USPTO		(703) 872-9306
From: Kevin J. Zilka		

Docket No: NAIIP360/00.148.01

App. No: 09/823,438

Total Number of Pages Being Transmitted, Including Cover Sheet: 38

### Message:

Please deliver to the Appeal Brief division for Patents.

Thank you,

Kevin J. Zilka

☐ Original to follow Via Regular Mail ☒ Original will Not be Sent ☐ Original will follow Via Overnight Courier

\*\*\*\*\*  
The information contained in this facsimile message is attorney privileged and confidential information intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify us by telephone (if long distance, please call collect) and return the original message to us at the above address via the U.S. Postal Service. Thank you.  
\*\*\*\*\*

IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL PAGES OR IF YOU ENCOUNTER  
ANY OTHER DIFFICULTY, PLEASE PHONE Erica  
AT (408) 971-2573 AT YOUR EARLIEST CONVENIENCE

June 28, 2005

RECEIVED  
OIPE/IAP

JUN 29 2005

Practitioner's Docket No. NAI1P360/00.148.01

PATENT

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Edwards et al.

Application No.: 09/823,438

Group No.: 2137

Filed: 03/30/2001

Examiner: Michael Pyzocha

For: VIRUS SCANNING PRIORITIZATION USING PRE-PROCESSOR CHECKING

Mail Stop Appeal Briefs - Patents

Commissioner for Patents

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF  
(PATENT APPLICATION-37 C.F.R. § 1.192)

1. Transmitted herewith is the APPEAL BRIEF in this application, with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on April 28, 2005.
2. STATUS OF APPLICANT

This application is on behalf of other than a small entity.

## CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.8(a) and 1.10\*

*(When using Express Mail, the Express Mail label number is mandatory;  
Express Mail certification is optional.)*

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

## MAILING

deposited with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)

with sufficient postage as first class mail.

37 C.F.R. § 1.10\*

as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee"

Mailing Label No. \_\_\_\_\_ (mandatory)

## TRANSMISSION

facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office, (703) 872-9306.

Date: 6/28/05

Signature

Jamie L. Rossi

(type or print name of person certifying)

\* Only the date of filing ( ' 1.6 ) will be the date used in a patent term adjustment calculation, although the date on any certificate of mailing or transmission under ' 1.8 continues to be taken into account in determining timeliness. See ' 1.703(f). Consider "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" ( ' 1.10 ) or facsimile transmission ( ' 1.6(d) ) for the reply to be accorded the earliest possible filing date for patent term adjustment calculations.

Transmittal of Appeal Brief--page 1 of 2

**RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JUN 28 2005

**3. FEE FOR FILING APPEAL BRIEF**

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2), the fee for filing the Appeal Brief is:

other than a small entity \$500.00

**Appeal Brief fee due \$500.00**

**4. EXTENSION OF TERM**

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 apply.

Applicant believes that no extension of term is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

**5. TOTAL FEE DUE**

The total fee due is:

Appeal brief fee \$500.00  
Extension fee (if any) \$0.00

**TOTAL FEE DUE \$500.00**

**6. FEE PAYMENT**

Authorization is hereby made to charge the amount of \$500.00 to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P360).

A duplicate of this transmittal is attached.

**7. FEE DEFICIENCY**

If any additional extension and/or fee is required, and if any additional fee for claims is required, charge Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P360).

Reg. No.: 41,429  
Tel. No.: 408-971-2573  
Customer No.: 28875

Signature of Practitioner  
Kevin J. Zilka  
Zilka-Kotab, PC  
P.O. Box 721120  
San Jose, CA 95172-1120  
USA

Transmittal of Appeal Brief--page 2 of 2



Practitioner's Docket No. NAIIP360/00.148.01

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: Edwards et al.

Application No.: 09/823,438

Group No.: 2137

Filed: 03/30/2001

Examiner: Michael Pyzocha

For: VIRUS SCANNING PRIORITIZATION USING PRE-PROCESSOR CHECKING

PATENT  
RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 28 2005

Mail Stop Appeal Briefs - Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF  
(PATENT APPLICATION-37 C.F.R. § 1.192)

1. Transmitted herewith is the APPEAL BRIEF in this application, with respect to the Notice of Appeal filed on April 28, 2005.
2. STATUS OF APPLICANT

This application is on behalf of other than a small entity.

## CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.8(a) and 1.10\*

(When using Express Mail, the Express Mail label number is mandatory;  
Express Mail certification is optional.)

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being:

## MAILING

deposited with the United States Postal Service in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

37 C.F.R. § 1.8(a)  
with sufficient postage as first class mail.37 C.F.R. § 1.10\*  
as "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee"  
Mailing Label No. (mandatory)

## TRANSMISSION

facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office, (703) 872-9306.

Date:

6/28/05

Signature

Jamie L. Rossi

(type or print name of person certifying)

\* Only the date of filing (' 1.6) will be the date used in a patent term adjustment calculation, although the date on any certificate of mailing or transmission under ' 1.8 continues to be taken into account in determining timeliness. See ' 1.703(f). Consider "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" (' 1.10) or facsimile transmission (' 1.6(d)) for the reply to be accorded the earliest possible filing date for patent term adjustment calculations.

Transmittal of Appeal Brief--page 1 of 2

## 3. FEE FOR FILING APPEAL BRIEF

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.20(b)(2), the fee for filing the Appeal Brief is:

other than a small entity \$500.00

**Appeal Brief fee due \$500.00**

## 4. EXTENSION OF TERM

The proceedings herein are for a patent application and the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 apply.

Applicant believes that no extension of term is required. However, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that applicant has inadvertently overlooked the need for a petition and fee for extension of time.

## 5. TOTAL FEE DUE

The total fee due is:

Appeal brief fee \$500.00  
Extension fee (if any) \$0.00

**TOTAL FEE DUE \$500.00**

## 6. FEE PAYMENT

Authorization is hereby made to charge the amount of \$500.00 to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P360).

A duplicate of this transmittal is attached.

## 7. FEE DEFICIENCY

If any additional extension and/or fee is required, and if any additional fee for claims is required, charge Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P360).

Reg. No.: 41,429  
Tel. No.: 408-971-2573  
Customer No.: 28875

Signature of Practitioner  
Kevin J. Zilka  
Zilka-Kotab, PC  
P.O. Box 721120  
San Jose, CA 95172-1120  
USA

Transmittal of Appeal Brief--page 2 of 2

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 28 2005

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of: )  
Edwards et al. ) Group Art Unit: 2137  
Application No. 09/823,438 ) Examiner: Pyzocha, Michael  
Filed: March 30, 2001 ) Date: June 28, 2005  
For: VIRUS SCANNING PRIORITIZATION) )  
USING PRE-PROCESSOR CHECKING )

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**ATTENTION: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences**

**APPEAL BRIEF (37 C.F.R. § 41.37)**

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal, filed in this case on April 28, 2005.

The fees required under § 1.17, and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefor, are dealt with in the accompanying TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF.

This brief contains these items under the following headings, and in the order set forth below (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(i)):

- I REAL PARTY IN INTEREST
- II RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES
- III STATUS OF CLAIMS
- IV STATUS OF AMENDMENTS
- V SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER
- VI ISSUES
- VII ARGUMENTS

06/30/2005 WABDELRI 00000067 501351 09823438  
01 FC:1402 500.00 DA

VIII APPENDIX OF CLAIMS INVOLVED IN THE APPEAL

IX APPENDIX LISTING ANY EVIDENCE RELIED ON BY THE APPELLANT  
IN THE APPEAL

The final page of this brief bears the practitioner's signature.

**I REAL PARTY IN INTEREST (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i))**

The real party in interest in this appeal is McAfee, Inc.

## II RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c) (1)(ii))

With respect to other prior or pending appeals, interferences, or related judicial proceedings that will directly affect, or be directly affected by, or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal, there are no other such appeals, interferences, or related judicial proceedings.

Since no such proceedings exist, no Related Proceedings Appendix is appended hereto.

### III STATUS OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c) (1)(iii))

#### A. TOTAL NUMBER OF CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

Claims in the application are: 1-5, 7-11, 17-23, 25-29, 35-41, 43-47 and 53-59

#### B. STATUS OF ALL THE CLAIMS IN APPLICATION

1. Claims withdrawn from consideration: None
2. Claims pending: 1-5, 7-11, 17-23, 25-29, 35-41, 43-47 and 53-59
3. Claims allowed: None
4. Claims rejected: 1-5, 7-11, 17-23, 25-29, 35-41, 43-47 and 53-59

#### C. CLAIMS ON APPEAL

The claims on appeal are: 1-5, 7-11, 17-23, 25-29, 35-41, 43-47 and 53-59

See additional status information in the Appendix of Claims.

**IV STATUS OF AMENDMENTS (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))**

As to the status of any amendment filed subsequent to final rejection, there are no such amendments after final.

## V SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v))

With respect to a summary of Claim 1 et al., as shown in Figures 3 and 4, a method for prioritizing virus scan requests is provided including checking a virus scan request to determine if scanning an object of the request is necessary (e.g. item 320 of Figure 3) and placing the virus scan request on a queue in a priority order based on a characteristic of the virus scan request (e.g. item 350 of Figure 3). The characteristic includes at least one of an identity of the user triggering the virus scan request, a type of the process accessing the object, a time stamp of when the virus request was received, and an indication of a network node accessing the object, wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on at least one of the user identity being an administrator as compared to a regular user, the process type being an operating system as compared to a user appellant, the time stamp being earlier than the time stamps of each scan request previously placed on the queue, and the indication being that the object is accessed from a server console as compared to a network client (e.g. item 430 of Figure 3). Note page 13, line 9 – page 14, line 18 and page 11, line 8 – page 12, line 6, for example.

With respect to a summary of Claim 37 et al., the above summary is incorporated, at least in part, by reference. In addition, Figure 5 shows a virus scanner including a pre-processor thread that checks a virus scan request to determine if scanning an object of the request is necessary (e.g. item 320 of Figure 3) and a queue that receives the virus scan request in a priority order based on characteristics of the virus scan request, the characteristics including at least two of an identity of the user triggering the virus scan request, a type of the process accessing the object, a time stamp of when the virus scan request was received, and an indication of a network node accessing the object, wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on at least two of the user identity being an administrator as compared to a regular user, the process type of being an operating system as compared to a user application, the time stamp being earlier than the time stamps of each scan request previously placed on the queue, and the indication being that the object is accessed from a server console as compared to a network client (e.g. items 530-550 of Figure 5). Note page 14, line 19 – page 15, line 13, for example.

With respect to a summary of Claim 55 et al., the above summaries are incorporated, at least in part, by reference. In addition, Figure 6 shows a computer system is provided including a processor coupled to a system bus (e.g. item 605 of Figure 6), a memory coupled to the processor through the system bus (e.g. items 602-604 of Figure 6), a machine-accessible medium coupled to the processor through the system bus (e.g. items 621-627 of Figure 6), and a virus scanning process executed from the machine-accessible medium by the processor, wherein the virus scanning process causes the processor to check a virus scanning request to determine if scanning an object of the request is necessary, and if so to further place the checked virus scan request on a queue in a priority order based on characteristics of the virus scan request, the characteristics including each of an identity of the user triggering the virus scan request, a type of the process accessing the object, a time stamp of when the virus scan request was received, and an indication of a network node accessing the object, wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on the user identity being an administrator as compared to a regular user, the process type being an operating system as compared to a user application, the time stamp being earlier than the time stamps of each scan request previously placed on the queue, and the indication being that the object is accessed from a server console as compared to a network client (e.g. item 430 of Figure 3). Note page 15, line 14 – page 17, line 18, for example.

**VI ISSUES (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))**

Following, under each issue listed, is a concise statement setting forth the corresponding ground of rejection.

Issue # 1: The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-11, 17, 19-23, 25-29 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,632 in view of Wong, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,465.

Issue # 2: The Examiner has rejected Claims 18 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,632 in view of Wong, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,465, in further view of McAfee (webpage).

Issue # 3: The Examiner has rejected Claims 37-41 and 43-53 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,632 in view of Wong, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,465, in further view of Chiussi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,532,213.

Issue # 4: The Examiner has rejected Claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,632 in view of Wong, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,465, in further view of Chiussi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,532,213, in further view of McAfee (webpage).

Issue # 5: The Examiner has rejected Claims 55-59 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,632 in view of Wong, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,465, in further view of Chiussi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,532,213, in further view of "Chapter Thirteen Performance Tuning" (webpage), in further view of Using Netware 3.12 (webpage).

## VII ARGUMENTS (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))

The claims of the groups noted below do not stand or fall together. In the present section, appellant explains why the claims of each group are believed to be separately patentable.

### Issue # 1:

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-11, 17, 19-23, 25-29 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,632 in view of Wong, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,465.

#### *Group # 1: Claims 1, 2, 17, 19, 20 and 35*

The Examiner has relied on the following excerpt from Chess to meet appellant's claimed: "checking a virus scan request to determine if scanning an object of the request is necessary; and placing the virus scan request on a queue in a priority order based on a characteristic of the virus scan request" (see Claim 1 and similar, but not identical, language in remaining independent claims).

"The units of digital data preferably include queries or files. In one such embodiment, the distributed system includes a computer protection system and the units of digital data include files or checksums of files which are suspected to contain malicious code. The malicious code may include computer viruses, worms or Trojan Horses.

It is preferable that the prioritizing step comprises the steps of: classifying the queued queries or files into categories, clustering the files, in each of the categories, into similarity clusters; choosing, for each similarity cluster, one or more representatives; and determining an order of processing for the one or more representatives. The classifying step preferably includes the step of classifying the queued queries or files according to the type of digital object they contain." (col. 3, lines 42-56)

Appellant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Specifically, Chess merely suggests classifying queries or files *already* queued, for *prioritized processing*. In sharp contrast, appellant teaches and claims placing the virus scan requests on a queue in a priority order based on a characteristic of the virus scan request, for

*prioritized queuing*. Thus, Chess's prioritization (as well as Wong's, for that matter) is specific to a *classification* process that occurs *after queuing*, while appellant's prioritization is specific to the *queuing process itself during queuing*.

In the Advisory Action dated 4/19/2005, the Examiner has stated that Chess' rearranging of the queue is still placing requests in a prioritized order onto a queue and it is not claimed that this should be done during queuing. Appellant respectfully disagrees with such an assertion. Specifically, appellant claims "placing the virus scan request on a queue in a priority order..." (emphasis added), and therefore clearly claims that the prioritizing is done during queuing.

Still yet, the Examiner has relied on the following excerpt from Wong to meet appellant's claimed: "the characteristic including at least one of an identity of the user triggering the virus scan request ... wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on at least one of the user identity being an administrator as compared to a regular user" (see Claim 1 and similar, but not identical, language in remaining independent claims).

"Whenever an outbound packet is to be transmitted, prioritization software module 208 examines that packet to determine whether it should be stored in queue 209. The prioritization software module 208 makes its determination based upon a particular configuration scheme. It is the function of software module 208 to initially configure the prioritization scheme. The configuration process entails specifying a number of different priority levels. For each of these priority levels, the software module 208 specifies a number of buffers within queue 209 which are to be reserved for that particular priority level. A buffer is a discrete unit of memory which is used to store one packet. The size of the packets and buffers can vary, depending on the hardware and software considerations." (col. 4, lines 14-41)

Appellant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Specifically, there is absolutely no mention in the foregoing excerpt, nor the remaining Wong reference, of any sort of placing virus scan requests in a queue based on a virus scan request characteristic including "an identity of the user triggering the virus scan request ... wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on at least one of the user identity being an administrator as compared to a regular user" (emphasis added), as claimed.

In the Advisory Action dated 4/19/2005, the Examiner has stated that Col. 4, lines 27-41 of Wong teaches different users where the user is sending the request. Appellant respectfully asserts, however, that Wong teaches assigning priority based on input from either a user or network administrator. This clearly does not meet the specificity of appellant's claims, since such input does meet triggering a virus scan request, as claimed.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based on appellant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed.Cir.1991). Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the first and third elements of the *prima facie* case of obviousness have not been met.

Appellant thus respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, since the prior art references, when combined, fail to teach or suggest all of the claim limitations, as noted above.

Still yet, with respect to the first element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to use Wong's method of prioritization to prioritize the requests of Chess et al. Appellant respectfully disagrees with this proposition, especially in view of the vast evidence to the contrary.

For example, Chess relates to a distributed security system, while Wong relates to a network data packet prioritization system. To simply glean features from a network data packet prioritization system, such as that of Wong, and combine the same with the *non-analogous art of distributed security systems*, such as that of Chess would

simply be improper. A network data packet prioritization system prioritizes data packets via a network device, while a distributed security system detects viruses, etc. "In order to rely on a reference as a basis for rejection of an appellant's invention, the reference must either be in the field of appellant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the inventor was concerned." In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 1446, 24 USPQ2d 1443, 1445 (Fed. Cir. 1992). See also In re Deminski, 796 F.2d 436, 230 USPQ 313 (Fed. Cir. 1986); In re Clay, 966 F.2d 656, 659, 23 USPQ2d 1058, 1060-61 (Fed. Cir. 1992) In view of the vastly different types of problems a distributed security system addresses as opposed to a network data packet prioritization system, the Examiner's proposed combination is inappropriate. To simply dismiss appellant's unique application of prioritization techniques in the specific context of a security system would improperly frustrate the inventive concepts of appellant.

*Group # 2: Claims 3 and 21*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 3, line 47-Col. 4, line 5 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed "wherein selecting is based on the priority order." Appellant respectfully asserts that the only "selecting" taught by the above excerpt simply relates to selecting "N smallest files in each cluster as the one or more representatives..." Further, the only priority taught by Chess relates to prioritizing the representatives (see Col. 3, lines 52-53). Therefore, the actual selecting of files to be representatives cannot be prioritized since the prioritizing only happens once the representatives are selected (see Col. 4, line 1).

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 3: Claims 4, 9, 22 and 27*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 3, line 47-Col. 4, line 5 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed "wherein selecting is based on the characteristic of the virus scan request." Such excerpt however, merely teaches that "selecting N

smallest files in each cluster as the one or more representatives..." There is simply no disclosure of any basis from which such files are selected, and therefore no disclosure of such basis being the "characteristic of the virus scan request" in the manner claimed by appellant.

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 4: Claims 5 and 23*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 4, lines 6-13 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed "scanning the object of the selected virus scan request." However, such excerpt merely teaches "updating the prioritizing information," and thus there is not even a suggestion of actually scanning an object.

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 5: Claims 7, 8, 25 and 26*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 3, lines 48-64 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed technique "wherein the priority order is further based on comparing the characteristics of the virus scan request with the characteristics of the virus scan requests previously placed on the queue." Appellant respectfully asserts that such excerpt relied on by the Examiner simply discloses that files are clustered according to a code-similarity measure evaluated on a probably-malicious part of each file. Therefore, files that are presently in the queue are prioritized according to their code, and thus there is no teaching of "comparing the characteristics of the virus scan request with the characteristics of the virus scan requests previously placed on the queue," as claimed by appellant.

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 6: Claims 10, 11, 28 and 29*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 4, lines 9-13 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed "wherein selecting is further based on comparing the characteristics of the virus scan requests placed in the queue with the characteristics of the previously selected virus scan requests whose objects are currently being scanned." Such excerpt, however, only discloses updating prioritization information based on identifying other queued files as being in the same cluster as a file that has been determined to be malicious. There is simply no disclosure of "objects currently being scanned," in the context claimed by appellant.

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

Issue # 2:

The Examiner has rejected Claims 18 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,632 in view of Wong, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,465, in further view of McAfee (webpage).

*Group # 1: Claims 18 and 36*

Such claims are deemed allowable for the reasons base Claim 1 is deemed allowable.

Issue # 3:

The Examiner has rejected Claims 37-41 and 43-53 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,632 in view of Wong, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,465, in further view of Chiussi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,532,213.

*Group # 1: Claims 37, 38 and 53*

Such claims are deemed allowable for the reasons based Claim 1 is deemed allowable.

In addition, the Examiner has relied on the following excerpt from Chiussi to meet appellant's claimed "characteristics including ... a time stamp of when the virus request was received ... wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on ... the time stamp being earlier than the time stamps of each scan request previously placed on the queue."

"A system is disclosed that services a plurality of queues associated with respective data connections in a packet communication network such that the system guarantees data transfer delays between the data source and the destination of each data connection. This is achieved in two stages. The first stage shapes the traffic of each connection such that it conforms to a specified envelope. The second stage associates timestamps with the packets released by the first stage and chooses for transmission from among them the one with the smallest timestamp. Both stages are associated with a discrete set of delay classes. The first stage employs one shaping structure per delay class. Each shaping structure in turn supports a discrete set of rates and employs a FIFO of connections per supported rate. A connection may move between FIFOs corresponding to different rates as its rate requirement changes. The second stage associates with each packet exiting the first stage a timestamp given by the exit time from the first stage and the delay class to which the connection belongs. A queue of packets is maintained per delay class, and the scheduler selects for transmission from among the packets at the head of the queues the one with the smallest timestamp." (Abstract)

Appellant respectfully disagrees with this assertion. Specifically, there is absolutely no mention in the foregoing excerpt, nor the remaining Chiussi reference, of any sort of placing virus scan requests in a queue based on a virus scan request characteristic including "a time stamp of when the virus request was received ... wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on ... the time stamp being earlier than the time stamps of each scan request previously placed on the queue" (emphasis added), as claimed.

In the Advisory Action dated 4/19/05, the Examiner has argued that Chiussi teaches timestamps and the smallest timestamp being used first. However, appellant respectfully asserts that Chiussi only "associates timestamps with the packets released

by the first stage" where the first stage "shapes the traffic of each connection such that it conforms to a specified envelope." Therefore, the timestamp only relates to the first stage, as described above, and not to when a virus request is received, in the manner claimed by appellant. In addition, in Chiussi, the packet with the smallest time stamp is transmitted, and not prioritized with other virus scan requests, in the manner claimed by appellant.

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 2: Claim 39*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 3, line 47-Col. 4, line 5 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed technique "wherein the selection is based on the priority order." Appellant respectfully asserts that the only "selecting" taught by the above excerpt simply relates to selecting "N smallest files in each cluster as the one or more representatives..." Further, the only priority taught by Chess relates to prioritizing the representatives (see Col. 3, lines 52-53). Therefore, the actual selecting of files to be representatives cannot be prioritized since the prioritizing only happens once the representatives are selected (see Col. 4, line 1).

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 3: Claims 40 and 45*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 3, line 47-Col. 4, line 5 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed technique "wherein the selection is based on the characteristic of the virus scan request." Such excerpt however, merely teaches that "selecting N smallest files in each cluster as the one or more representatives..." There is simply no disclosure of any basis from which such files are selected, and therefore no disclosure of such basis being the "characteristic of the virus scan request," in the manner claimed by appellant.

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 4: Claims 41*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 4, lines 6-13 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed "scanner thread [that] further scans the object of the selected virus scan request." However, such excerpt merely teaches "updating the prioritizing information," and thus there is not even a suggestion of actually scanning an object.

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 5: Claims 43 and 44*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 3, lines 48-64 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed technique "wherein the priority order is further based on comparing the characteristics of the virus scan request with the characteristics of the virus scan requests previously placed on the queue." Appellant respectfully asserts that such excerpt relied on by the Examiner simply discloses that files are clustered according to a code-similarity measure evaluated on a probably-malicious part of each file. Therefore, files that are presently in the queue are prioritized according to their code, and thus there is no teaching of "comparing the characteristics of the virus scan request with the characteristics of the virus scan requests previously placed on the queue," as claimed by appellant.

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 6: Claims 46 and 47*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 4, lines 9-13 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed "wherein the selection is further based on comparing the characteristics of the virus scan requests placed in the queue with the characteristics of the previously selected virus scan requests whose objects are currently being scanned." Such excerpt, however, only discloses updating prioritization information based on identifying other queued files as being in the same cluster as a file that has been determined to be malicious. There is simply no disclosure of "objects currently being scanned," in the context claimed by appellant.

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

Issue # 4:

The Examiner has rejected Claim 54 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,632 in view of Wong, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,465, in further view of Chiussi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,532,213, in further view of McAfee (webpage).

*Group # 1: Claim 54*

Such claim is deemed allowable for the reasons base Claim 37 is deemed allowable.

Issue # 5:

The Examiner has rejected Claims 55-59 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chess et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,560,632 in view of Wong, U.S. Patent No. 5,974,465, in further view of Chiussi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,532,213, in further view of "Chapter Thirteen Performance Tuning" (webpage), in further view of Using Netware 3.12 (webpage).

*Group # 1: Claims 55 and 56*

Such claim is deemed allowable for the reasons Claim 1 is deemed allowable.

In addition, the Examiner has relied on the following excerpts from Performance and NetWare to meet appellant's claimed "the characteristic including .... a type of the process accessing the object... and an indication of a network node accessing the object, wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on .... the process type being an operating system as compared to a user appellant and ..... the indication being that the object is accessed from a server console as compared to a network client" (see Claim 55 and similar, but not identical, language in remaining independent claims).

### Application Priority

- 0-15: User-accessible process priorities
  - 0-6: Low user range
  - 4: Low value
  - 7: Normal
  - 13: High value
  - 8-15: High user range
- 16-31: System-accessible process priorities
  - 16-24: Real-time values accessible to Administrator-level accounts
  - 24: Real-time value
  - 25-31: Real-time value accessible to operating system only

(see page 4 of Performance)

### SEND

SEND is used almost exactly like BROADCAST. The only difference is that messages sent with SEND are treated as regular-priority messages, similar to those you receive from another user's workstation, whereas messages sent with BROADCAST are treated as high-priority alerts from the server console. Users can prevent receipt of messages sent with SEND by using the CASTOFF command, but BROADCAST requires the CASTOFF ALL command.

(see page 7 of Netware)

The Examiner has also argued that "Performance teaches prioritization based on process types (see page 4) and Netware teaches prioritization based on network node type (see page 8)." Appellant respectfully disagrees with such assertion, as it

appears that the Examiner has simply failed to consider the full weight of appellant's claims.

Specifically, the Performance excerpt above simply fails to meet appellant's claimed "characteristic including .... a type of the process accessing the object... wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on .... the process type being an operating system as compared to a user application" (emphasis added). As clearly set forth in the relevant excerpts hereinabove, Performance suggests processes that are accessible by user and system applications, and fall short of a process that specifically accesses the object, as claimed, where one of the process types is an operation system process (note that a system application does not meet an operating system).

Further, the Netware excerpt above fails to meet appellant's claimed "characteristic including ....an indication of a network node accessing the object, wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on ... the indication being that the object is accessed from a server console as compared to a network client." Again, similar to the Performance reference, Netware does not meet appellant's claimed node that accesses the object, as claimed. Instead Network merely suggests two types of messages, one sent using a SEND feature, and one sent using a BROADCAST feature.

In the Advisory Action dated 4/19/05, the Examiner has stated that page 4 of Performance at 25-31 in the last part of the list teaches operating system processes. However, appellant respectfully asserts that the above excerpt does not teach "a type of process accessing the object" where the object is the item that is requested to be scanned (see Claim 55).

Also in the Advisory Action dated 4/19/05, the Examiner has stated that "the SEND feature teaches the server console and the BROADCAST feature teaches a network client which make the requests." Appellant respectfully asserts that SEND, as in Netware, does not teach an indication of a network node accessing an object, as claimed, since it only relates to messages sent between workstations. In addition,

BROADCAST, as in Netware, is simply a message sent by Netware to all users. Again, there is no accessing of an object, as claimed by appellant. In addition, even if receiving the message did indicate accessing an object, Netware would still not meet appellant's specific claim language since, in both the SEND and BROADCAST instances, a workstation (user) is receiving the message, and appellant claims the object being "accessed from a server console as compared to a network client."

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 2: Claim 57*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 3, line 47-Col. 4, line 5 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed "wherein selecting is based on the priority order." Appellant respectfully asserts that the only "selecting" taught by the above excerpt simply relates to selecting "N smallest files in each cluster as the one or more representatives..." Further, the only priority taught by Chess relates to prioritizing the representatives (see Col. 3, lines 52-53). Therefore, the actual selecting of files to be representatives cannot be prioritized since the prioritizing only happens once the representatives are selected (see Col. 4, line 1).

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 3: Claim 58*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 3, line 47-Col. 4, line 5 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed "wherein selecting is based on the characteristic of the virus scan request." Such excerpt however, merely teaches that "selecting N smallest files in each cluster as the one or more representatives..." There is simply no disclosure of any basis from which such files are selected, and therefore no

disclosure of such basis being the "characteristic of the virus scan request," in the manner claimed by appellant.

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

*Group # 4: Claim 59*

The Examiner has relied on Col. 4, lines 6-13 of Chess to make a prior art showing of appellant's claimed "scanning the object of the selected virus scan request." However, such excerpt merely teaches "updating the prioritizing information," and thus there is not even a suggestion of actually scanning an object.

Appellant respectfully asserts that at least the third element of the *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been met, for the reasons set forth hereinabove.

In view of the remarks set forth hereinabove, all of the independent claims are deemed allowable, along with any claims depending therefrom.

**VIII APPENDIX OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))**

The text of the claims involved in the appeal (along with associated status information) is set forth below:

1. (Previously Presented) A method for prioritizing virus scan requests comprising:  
checking a virus scan request to determine if scanning an object of the request is necessary; and  
placing the virus scan request on a queue in a priority order based on a characteristic of the virus scan request, the characteristic including at least one of an identity of the user triggering the virus scan request, a type of the process accessing the object, a time stamp of when the virus request was received, and an indication of a network node accessing the object, wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on at least one of the user identity being an administrator as compared to a regular user, the process type being an operating system as compared to a user appellant, the time stamp being earlier than the time stamps of each scan request previously placed on the queue, and the indication being that the object is accessed from a server console as compared to a network client.
2. (Original) The method of claim 1, further comprising:  
selecting a one of the virus scan requests from the queue.
3. (Original) The method of claim 2, wherein selecting is based on the priority order.
4. (Original) The method of claim 2, wherein selecting is based on the characteristic of the virus scan request.
5. (Original) The method of claim 2, further comprising:  
scanning the object of the selected virus scan request.
6. (Cancelled)

7. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the priority order is further based on comparing the characteristic of the virus scan request with the characteristics of the virus scan requests previously placed on the queue.
8. (Original) The method of claim 7, wherein the priority order is further based on a parameter indicating which of the compared characteristics is given higher priority.
9. (Original) The method of claim 4, wherein selecting is further based on comparing the characteristics of the virus scan requests placed in the queue.
10. (Original) The method of claim 9, wherein selecting is further based on comparing the characteristics of the virus scan requests placed in the queue with the characteristics of the previously selected virus scan requests whose objects are currently being scanned.
11. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein selecting is further based on a parameter indicating which of the compared characteristics is given higher priority.
12. (Cancelled)
13. (Cancelled)
14. (Cancelled)
15. (Cancelled)
16. (Cancelled)
17. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein scanning is necessary when a virus scan status indicates the object is not known to be virus free.

18. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein scanning is necessary when the object of the virus scan request is in a directory not excluded from virus scanning.
19. (Previously Presented) An apparatus comprising:
- a machine-accessible medium having stored thereon executable instructions to cause a computer to perform
  - checking a virus scan request to determine if scanning is necessary;
  - and
  - placing the virus scan request on a queue in a priority order based on a characteristic of the virus scan request, the characteristic including at least one of an identity of the user triggering the virus scan request, a type of the process accessing the object, a time stamp of when the virus scan request was received, and an indication of a network node accessing the object, wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on at least one of the user identity being an administrator as compared to a regular user, the process type being an operating system as compared to a user application, the time stamp being earlier than the time stamps of each scan request previously placed on the queue, and the indication being that the object is accessed from a server console as compared to a network client.
20. (Original) The apparatus of claim 19, further comprising instructions for selecting a one of the virus scan requests from the queue.
21. (Original) The apparatus of claim 20, wherein the instructions for selecting is based on the priority order.
22. (Original) The apparatus of claim 20, wherein the instructions for selecting is based on the characteristic of the virus scan request.
23. (Original) The apparatus of claim 20, further comprising instructions for scanning the object of the selected virus scan request.

24. (Cancelled)

25. (Original) The apparatus of claim 20, wherein the instructions for placing the virus scan request on the queue in the priority order are further based on comparing the characteristic of the virus scan request with the characteristics of the virus scan requests previously placed on the queue.

26. (Original) The apparatus of claim 25, wherein the instructions for placing the virus scan request on the queue in the priority order are further based on a parameter indicating which of the compared characteristics is given higher priority.

27. (Original) The apparatus of claim 20, wherein the instructions for selecting are further based on comparing the characteristics of the virus scan requests placed in the queue.

28. (Original) The apparatus of claim 27, wherein the instructions for selecting are further based on comparing the characteristics of the virus scan requests placed in the queue with the characteristics of the previously selected virus scan requests whose objects are currently being scanned.

29. (Original) The apparatus of claim 27, wherein the instructions for selecting are further based on a parameter indicating which of the compared characteristics is given higher priority.

30. (Cancelled)

31. (Cancelled)

32. Cancelled)

33. (Cancelled)

34. (Cancelled)
35. (Original) The apparatus of claim 19, wherein the instructions for checking to determine if scanning is necessary include determining when a virus scan status indicates the object is not known to be virus free.
36. (Original) The apparatus of claim 19, wherein the instructions for checking to determine if scanning is necessary include determining when the object of the virus scan request is in a directory not excluded from virus scanning.
37. (Previously Presented) A virus scanner comprising:  
a pre-processor thread that checks a virus scan request to determine if scanning an object of the request is necessary;  
a queue that receives the virus scan request in a priority order based on characteristics of the virus scan request, the characteristics including at least two of an identity of the user triggering the virus scan request, a type of the process accessing the object, a time stamp of when the virus scan request was received, and an indication of a network node accessing the object, wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on at least two of the user identity being an administrator as compared to a regular user, the process type of being an operating system as compared to a user application, the time stamp being earlier than the time stamps of each scan request previously placed on the queue, and the indication being that the object is accessed from a server console as compared to a network client.
38. (Original) The virus scanner of claim 37, further comprising:  
a scanner thread that selects a one of the virus scan requests from the queue.
39. (Original) The virus scanner of claim 38, wherein the selection is based on the priority order.

40. (Original) The virus scanner of claim 38, wherein the selection is based on the characteristic of the virus scan request.
41. (Original) The virus scanner of claim 38, wherein the scanner thread further scans the object of the selected virus scan request.
42. (Cancelled)
43. (Original) The virus scanner of claim 37, wherein the priority order is further based on comparing the characteristic of the virus scan request with the characteristics of the virus scan requests previously placed on the queue.
44. (Original) The virus scanner of claim 43, wherein the priority order is further based on a parameter indicating which of the compared characteristics is given higher priority.
45. (Original) The virus scanner of claim 40, wherein the selection is further based on comparing the characteristics of the virus scan requests placed in the queue.
46. (Original) The virus scanner of claim 45, wherein the selection is further based on comparing the characteristics of the virus scan requests placed in the queue with the characteristics of the previously selected virus scan requests whose objects are currently being scanned.
47. (Original) The virus scanner of claim 46, wherein the selection is further based on a parameter indicating which of the compared characteristics is given higher priority.
48. (Cancelled)
49. (Cancelled)
50. (Cancelled)

51. (Cancelled)

52. (Cancelled)

53. (Original) The virus scanner of claim 37, wherein determining that scanning is necessary includes determining when a virus scan status indicates the object is not known to be virus free.

54. (Original) The virus scanner of claim 37, wherein determining that scanning is necessary includes determining when the object of the virus scan request is in a directory not excluded from virus scanning.

55. (Previously Presented) A computer system comprising:

- a processor coupled to a system bus;

- a memory coupled to the processor through the system bus;

- a machine-accessible medium coupled to the processor through the system bus;

- a virus scanning process executed from the machine-accessible medium by the processor, wherein the virus scanning process causes the processor to check a virus scanning request to determine if scanning an object of the request is necessary, and if so to further place the checked virus scan request on a queue in a priority order based on characteristics of the virus scan request, the characteristics including each of an identity of the user triggering the virus scan request, a type of the process accessing the object, a time stamp of when the virus scan request was received, and an indication of a network node accessing the object, wherein the virus scan request is prioritized based on the user identity being an administrator as compared to a regular user, the process type being an operating system as compared to a user application, the time stamp being earlier than the time stamps of each scan request previously placed on the queue, and the indication being that the object is accessed from a server console as compared to a network client.

56. (Original) The computer system of claim 55, wherein the virus scanning process further causes the processor to select a one of the virus scan requests from the queue.
57. (Original) The computer system of claim 56, wherein the selection is based on the priority order.
58. (Original) The computer system of claim 56, wherein the selection is based on the characteristic of the virus scan request.
59. (Original) The computer system of claim 56, wherein the virus scanning process further causes the processor to scan the object of the selected virus scan request.
60. (Cancelled)

**IX APPENDIX LISTING ANY EVIDENCE RELIED ON BY THE APPELLANT  
IN THE APPEAL (37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))**

There is no such evidence.

In the event a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner may reach the undersigned at (408) 971-2573. For payment of any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1351 (Order No. NAI1P360\_00.0148.01).

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Date: 6/28/05

Kevin J. Zilka

Reg. No. 41,429

Zilka-Kotab, P.C.

P.O. Box 721120

San Jose, California 95172-1120

Telephone: (408) 971-2573

Facsimile: (408) 971-4660